

City of Seattle
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Use this application to propose a change in the policies, future land use map, appendices, or other components of the adopted City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Applications are due to the Seattle City Council no later than **5:00 p.m. on May 15th** for consideration in the next annual review cycle. Any proposals received after May 15th will be considered in the review process for the following year.

(Please Print or Type)

Date: May 15, 2012

Applicant: Chris Leman

Mailing Address: 2370 Yale Avenue East

City: Seattle
5463

State: WA *Zip:* 98102-3310

Phone: (206) 322-

E-mail: cleman@oo.net

Name of general area, location, or site that would be affected by this proposed change in text (attach additional sheets if necessary): Throughout the city.

If the application is approved for further consideration by the City Council, the applicant may be required to submit a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist.

Acceptance of this application does not guarantee final approval.

Applicant Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chris Leman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Date: May 15, 2012

REQUIRED QUESTIONNAIRE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application

Please answer the following questions in text and attach them to the application. Supporting maps or graphics may be included. Please answer all questions separately and reference the question number in your answer. The Council will consider an application incomplete unless all the questions are answered. When proposing an amendment, you must show that a change to the Comprehensive Plan is required.

1. Provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish. Include the name(s) of the Comprehensive Plan Element(s) (Land Use, Transportation, etc) you propose to amend.

Revise Policy N-3 of the Neighborhood Planning element by adding the underlined sentence:

N-3 Either community organizations or the City may initiate neighborhood plans with City support, to the extent provided in the City's annual budget. For those neighborhoods that wish to, the City is receptive to continuing the model of the 1990s under which it funds neighborhood organizations to the neighborhood planning process under City contract and according to City guidelines and oversight.

2. Describe how the issue is currently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. If the issue is not adequately addressed, describe the need for it.

The neighborhood plans that were developed in the late 1990s were done by grassroots volunteers and their consultants under contract to the City, according to City guidelines (below called the "grassroots model"). This process achieved =a remarkable degree of quality, cost-effectiveness and inclusiveness. Unfortunately, there is no explicit mention in the current Comprehensive Plan of the availability of this grassroots model. The proposed amendment is needed to correct this omission.

3. Describe why the proposed change meets the criteria adopted in Resolution 30662 for considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The criteria are listed at the end of this application form. Is a Comprehensive Plan amendment the best means for meeting the identified public need? What other options are there for meeting the identified public need?

Although the grassroots model was most distinctive about the generation of neighborhood plans in the 1990s, and most fundamental to their success, =the Comprehensive Plan is silent about this aspect. It is essential for the Comprehensive Plan to recognize the grassroots model; there is no other way to rectify this omission.

4. What do you anticipate will be the impacts caused by the change in text, including the geographic area affected and the issues presented? Why will the proposed change result in a net benefit to the community?

A benefit of this amendment will be to make it clear to the public that the City Council, Mayor, and executive branch are receptive to continuing the grassroots model, for those neighborhoods that wish to undertake it. As was the case with the recent generation of plans, any plans further conducted with the grassroots will be a major cost-savings to the City, and will have quality, detail, and responsiveness that are not possible if the same plan were conducted by City staff and consultants

5. How would the proposed change comply with the community vision statements, goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan? Please include any data, research, or reasoning that supports the proposed amendments.

This amendment is consistent with existing rhetoric in the Comprehensive Plan, but would establish with needed clarity a policy that is otherwise left unsaid. All of the evaluations that have been done of the recent neighborhood plans have found that the grassroots model was an important component in their success. These include the 2007 City Auditor performance audit and the book by Prof. Carmen Sirianni ,xxxx

6. Is there public support for this proposed text amendments (i.e. have you conducted community meetings, etc.)? Note: The City will provide a public participation process, public notice, and environmental review for all applications.

There is strong public support for this amendment, especially in that it does not require a neighborhood to undertake the grassroots approach, but empowers those who wish to do so. In various issuances, the City Neighborhood Council and the Seattle Community Council Federation have supported continuation of the grassroots model for neighborhood planning, for those neighborhoods that wish to undertake it.